FISH & NEAVE

875 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022-6250

COPY

October 17, 1990

AIR MAIL

Mr. John N. Basu
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL
ENGLAND

Re: Pakistani Pat. Appln. No. 392/89
Your File: 30591
Our File: PM-1322 (Pakistan)

Dear John:

Thank you for your October 3, 1990 letter enclosing a copy of the official action in this case.

With respect to Paragraph 1 of the action, I do not see in what way the marked phases can be considered unclear. For that reason, I agree with you and your Pakistani associate. I take it that your associate can make an appropriate argument along those lines in accordance with Pakistani practice.

With respect to Paragraph 2, I would agree with your associate's suggestion, subject to the inclusion of the word "substantially" as in the specification.

With respect to Paragraph 3, I assume this arose because the Pakistani application was filed with the abstract page at the front.

With respect to Ellis et al. U.S. Patent 3,356,094, a copy is enclosed. You are correct that it inadvertently escaped the deletion of identification of prior art. I recall that in some other countries, those identifications had to be put back in. However, here, and elsewhere where there has been no such requirement, I wonder

2026387157

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/fmmj0000

If, for consistency, it is possible to delete the identification of Ellis, so that page 2, lines 2-4 read "... article. In a similar smoking article, the tube becomes ...". I do not expect this to obviate the need to supply a copy of Ellis, but it might make the specification read better. Please let me have your thoughts.

Please let me know if you need anything further to prepare a response.

Very truly yours,

JHI:bms
Enc.

Jeffrey H. Ingerman

cc: Ms. Beverly A. Monroe (w/o enc.)

2026887158

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/fmmj0000